IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:	§	
William K. Bodin, *et al.*	§	Group Art Unit: 2178
	§	
Serial No.: 10/734,764	§	Examiner: Patel, Manglesh M.
	§	
Filed: 12/11/2003	§	Atty Docket No.: AUS920030835US1
	§	
Title: Creating A Presentation Document	§	Customer No.: 34533
	§	
	§	Confirmation No.: 1941

Mail Stop: Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPEAL BRIEF

Honorable Commissioner:

This is an Appeal Brief filed pursuant to 37 CFR § 41.37 in response to the Final Office Action of April 18, 2007 (hereinafter the "Office Action"), and pursuant to the Notice of Appeal filed July 17, 2007.

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest in accordance with 37 CFR § 41.37(c)(1)(i) is the patent assignee, International Business Machines Corporation ("IBM"), a New York corporation having a place of business at Armonk, New York 10504.

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no related appeals or interferences within the meaning of 37 CFR § 41.37(c)(1)(ii).

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Status of claims in accordance with 37 CFR § 41.37(c)(1)(iii): Twenty-four (24) claims are filed in the original application in this case. Claims 1-24 are rejected in the Office Action. Claims 1-24 are on appeal.

STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

Status of amendments in accordance with 37 CFR § 41.37(c)(1)(iv): No amendments were submitted after final rejection. The claims as currently presented are included in the Appendix of Claims that accompanies this Appeal Brief.

SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Appellants provide the following concise summary of the claimed subject matter according to 37 CFR § 41.37(c)(1)(v). This summary includes a concise explanation of the subject matter defined in each of the independent claims involved in the appeal and includes references to the specification by page and line number and to the drawings by elements. The three independent claims involved in this appeal are claims 1, 9, and 17. Claim 1 is a method claim. Claims 9 and 17 recite counterpart aspects of the method of claim 1. Claim 9 recites system aspects of the method of claim 1. Claim 17 recites computer program product aspects of the method of claim 1.

Claim 1 recites a method for creating a presentation document (described for example at page 11, lines 19-20, and Figure 3 at element 314). The method of claim 1 includes creating, in dependence upon an original document, a structured document comprising one or more structural elements (described for example at page 11, lines 20-28 and Figure 3 at elements 304, 302, 306, and 402). The method of claim 1 also includes creating a presentation grammar for the structured document, wherein the presentation grammar for the structured document includes grammar elements each of which includes a structural element identifier for at least one structural element of the structured

document (described for example at page 11, line 28, through page 15, line 15 and Figure 3 at elements 310, 312, 306, 316, 318, and 402).

Claim 9 recites a system for creating a presentation document (described for example at page 11, lines 19-20, and Figure 3 at element 314). The system of claim 9 includes means for creating, in dependence upon an original document, a structured document comprising one or more structural elements (described for example at page 11, lines 20-28 and Figure 3 at elements 304, 302, 306, and 402). The system of claim 9 also includes means for creating a presentation grammar for the structured document, wherein the presentation grammar for the structured document includes grammar elements each of which includes a structural element identifier for at least one structural element of the structured document (described for example at page 11, line 28, through page 15, line 15 and Figure 3 at elements 310, 312, 306, 316, 318, and 402). The means for carrying out the acts included in the system of claim 9 include a computer system (described for example at page 7, lines 5-15).

Claim 17 recites a computer program product for creating a presentation document (described for example at page 11, lines 19-20, and Figure 3 at element 314). The computer program product of claim 17 includes a recording medium (described for example at page 7, lines 19-21). The computer program product of claim 17 also includes means, recorded on the recording medium, for creating, in dependence upon an original document, a structured document comprising one or more structural elements (described for example at page 11, lines 20-28 and Figure 3 at elements 304, 302, 306, and 402). The computer program product of claim 17 also includes means, recorded on the recording medium, for creating a presentation grammar for the structured document, wherein the presentation grammar for the structured document includes grammar elements each of which includes a structural element identifier for at least one structural element of the structured document (described for example at page 11, line 28, through page 15, line 15 and Figure 3 at elements 310, 312, 306, 316, 318, and 402). The means for carrying out the acts included in the computer program product of claim 17 include computer program instructions embedded in the recording medium of the computer

program product (described for example at page 7, lines 17-28).

GROUNDS OF REJECTION

In accordance with 37 CFR § 41.37(c)(1)(vi), Appellants provide the following concise statement for each ground of rejection:

1. Claims 1-7, 9-15, and 17-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Raman (U.S. Patent 5,748,186).

2. Claims 8, 16, and 24 stand rejected for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raman in view of Josephson (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0023435 A1).

ARGUMENT

Appellants present the following argument pursuant to 37 CFR § 41.37(c)(1)(vii) regarding the ground of rejection on appeal in the present case.

Argument Regarding The First Ground Of Rejection On Appeal: Claims 1-7, 9-15, and 17-23 Are Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) As Being Unpatentable Over Raman

Claims 1-7, 9-15, and 17-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Raman (U.S. Patent 5,748,186) (hereinafter 'Raman'). To anticipate claims 1-7, 9-15, and 17-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), two basic requirements must be met. The first requirement of anticipation is that Raman must disclose each and every element and limitation as set forth in the Appellant's claims. The second requirement of anticipation is that Raman must enable Appellant's claims. Raman does not meet either requirement and therefore does not anticipate Appellant's claims.

Raman Does Not Disclose Each and Every Element Of The Claims Of The Present Application

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Independent claim 1 recites:

1. A method for creating a presentation document, the method comprising:

creating, in dependence upon an original document, a structured document comprising one or more structural elements; and

creating a presentation grammar for the structured document, wherein the presentation grammar for the structured document includes grammar elements each of which includes a structural element identifier for at least one structural element of the structured document.

As explained in more detail below, Raman does not disclose each and every element of claim 1, and Raman therefore cannot be said to anticipate the claims of the present application within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Raman Does Not Disclose Creating A Presentation Grammar For The Structured Document, Wherein The Presentation Grammar For The Structured Document Includes Grammar Elements Each Of Which Includes A Structural Element Identifier For At Least One Structural Element Of The Structured Document

The Office Action takes the position that Raman at column 6, lines 29-31, and claims 14 and 22 of Raman disclose the second element of claim 1: "creating a presentation grammar for the structured document, wherein the presentation grammar for the structured document includes grammar elements each of which includes a structural

element identifier for at least one structural element of the structured document." Appellants respectfully note in response that what Raman at column 6, lines 29-31,

> Control signals or events can include key strokes, mouse clicks, or other user input, including recognized speech.

In addition, Appellants respectfully note that what Raman at claims 14 and 22 in fact discloses is:

14. An interactive system for presenting source information, comprising:

a converter configured to convert electronically encoded data representing the source information to a common intermediate representation of the source information;

a presenter configured to convert the common intermediate representation into a presentation of the source information to a user;

an input device configured to enter user commands to select one or more of at least two modalities in which the source information is presentable; and

an interactive interface configured to receive a command entered on the input device and to issue a control signal representing the received command to the presentor, responsive to which the presenter controls the presentation of the source information in the selected one or more of the at least two modalities.

...

22. An interactive system according to claim 14, wherein:

the input device includes a speech input unit;

the at least two modalities include an aural presentation modality; and

with the aural presentation modality selected, interactivity between the interactive system and the user is accomplished using only speech.

That is, Raman at column 6, lines 29-31, and claims 14 and 22 of Raman disclose an interactive system for presenting source information in which the interactivity is accomplished using speech. Raman's interactive system using only speech, however, does not disclose creating a presentation grammar for the structured document, wherein the presentation grammar for the structured document includes grammar elements each of which includes a structural element identifier for at least one structural element of the structured document as claimed in the present application because Raman's interactive system does not use a grammar. In fact, Raman does not even mention at this point or anywhere else 'grammar,' 'presentation grammar,' 'grammar elements,' or 'creating a presentation grammar for the structured document, wherein the presentation grammar for the structured document includes grammar elements each of which includes a structural element identifier for at least one structural element of the structured document.' Because Raman does not disclose each and every element and limitation of Appellants' claims, Raman does not anticipate Appellants' claims, and the rejections of Appellants' claims should be withdrawn.

In the section of the Office Action entitled "Response To Arguments," the Office Action at page 10 takes the position that Raman "fully anticipates the 'presentation grammar' by teaching association of the presentation of information tied to control by voice commands." Raman, however, does not teach association of presentation of information tied to control by voice commands. What Raman teaches is "interactivity between the interactive system and the user is accomplished using only speech." Again, interactivity

using speech does not disclose creating a presentation grammar for the structured document, wherein the presentation grammar for the structured document includes grammar elements each of which includes a structural element identifier for at least one structural element of the structured document as claimed in the present application. As mentioned above, Raman simply does not describe such a grammar. Moreover, there is no need for a grammar necessarily or inherently in Raman, because, as is well known, speech recognition and speech interactivity can be carried out by so-called dictation systems that use large language dictionaries with no grammars of any kind, no voice recognition grammars, and no presentation grammars. Because Raman does not disclose each and every element and limitation of Appellants' claims, Raman does not anticipate Appellants' claims, and the rejections of Appellants' claims should be withdrawn.

Raman Does Not Enable Each and Every Element Of The Claims Of The Present Application

Not only must Raman disclose each and every element of the claims of the present application within the meaning of *Verdegaal* in order to anticipate Appellants' claims, but also Raman must be an enabling disclosure of each and every element of the claims of the present application within the meaning of *In re Hoeksema.* In *Hoeksema*, the claims were rejected because an earlier patent disclosed a structural similarity to the Appellant's chemical compound. The court in Hoeksema stated: "We think it is sound law, consistent with the public policy underlying our patent law, that before any publication can amount to a statutory bar to the grant of a patent, its disclosure must be such that a skilled artisan could take its teachings in combination with his own knowledge of the particular art and be in possession of the invention." *In re Hoeksema,* 399 F.2d 269, 273, 158 USPQ 596, 600 (CCPA 1968). The meaning of *Hoeksema* for the present case is that unless Raman places Appellants' claims in the possession of a person of ordinary skill in the art, Raman is legally insufficient to anticipate Appellants' claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Raman Does Not Place In The Possession Of A Person Of Ordinary Skilled In The Art Creating A Presentation Grammar For The Structured Document, Wherein The Presentation Grammar For The Structured Document Includes Grammar Elements Each Of Which Includes A Structural Element Identifier For At Least One Structural Element Of The Structured Document

The Office Action at page 10 takes the position that Raman at column 4, lines 38-43, column 3, lines 30-34, and column 2, lines 42-44, place in the possession of a person of ordinary skilled in the art: creating a presentation grammar for the structured document, wherein the presentation grammar for the structured document includes grammar elements each of which includes a structural element identifier for at least one structural element of the structured document as claimed in the present application. Appellants respectfully note in response that what Raman at column 4, lines 38-43 actually discloses is:

> Typically, the source document 111 is received by the retriever 120 as a sequential stream of digitally encoded signals, for example ASCII characters. The characters encode the text as well as the marks placed in the text to define the structure of the document 111; see FIG. 3 for description.

And what Raman at column 3, lines 30-34 actually discloses is:

> An interactive interface 150 coupled to I/O devices 160 can be used to control the retriever 120 and the presentor 140. The I/O devices 160 can include a monitor, a keyboard, a mouse, a telephone key-pad, a voice input unit coupled to a speech recognizer, and a speech synthesizer.

And what Ramat at column 2 liens 42-44 actually discloses is:

> As an advantage, the user can browse through the document taking the structure of the document into consideration.

That is, Raman at column 4, lines 38-43, column 3, lines 30-34, and column 2, lines 42-44, discloses browsing a source document taking the structure encoded into the document into consideration and discloses an interactive interface coupled to an I/O device – none of which discloses or enables creating a presentation grammar for the structured

document, wherein the presentation grammar for the structured document includes grammar elements each of which includes a structural element identifier for at least one structural element of the structured document as claimed in the present application. Again, nothing in Raman at these citations describes or mentions a presentation grammar. In fact, Raman at these citations, does not even mention 'grammar,' 'presentation grammar,' 'grammar elements,' or 'creating a presentation grammar for the structured document, wherein the presentation grammar for the structured document includes grammar elements each of which includes a structural element identifier for at least one structural element of the structured document.' Because Raman does not place in the possession of a person of ordinary skilled in the art each and every element and limitation of Appellants' claims, Raman does not anticipate Appellants' claims, and the rejections should be withdrawn.

The Office Action at pages 10 and 11 attempts to use the theory of inherency to supply the disclosure missing from Raman. The Office Action at page 10 states:

> It is inherent within the ability to verbally "browse through the document" based on its structure, combined with the fact that the document is marked according to structure, and the fact that verbal commands can control the "browsing," that Raman contains what the Appellants have labeled a "grammar" with a "structural element identifier." Raman does not use the Appellant's non-standard terminology, but Raman teaches the invention claimed.

That is, the Office Action invokes the theory of inherency as a basis for the rejection of claim 1 in the present application under 35 U.S.C. § 102. "In relying upon the theory of inherency, the examiner must provide a basis in fact and/or technical reasoning to reasonably support the determination that the allegedly inherent characteristic necessarily flows from the teachings of the applied prior art." *Ex parte Levy*, 17 USPQ2d 1461, 1464 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1990) cited in MPEP § 2112. That is, merely reciting the word "inherent" is insufficient basis for a rejection on the theory of inherency. In the present application, however, the Office Action makes no attempt to provide a basis in fact and/or technical reasoning to reasonably support the determination that a presentation

grammar for a structured document includes grammar elements each of which includes a structural element identifier for at least one structural element of the structured document necessarily flows from the teachings of the Raman. In fact, such a demonstration cannot be made because, as mentioned above, Raman's disclosure of interactivity between Raman's interactive system and a user using only speech may be carried out by so-called dictation systems that use large language dictionaries with no grammars of any kind, no voice recognition grammars, and no presentation grammars. Because the Office Action cannot provide the factual or technical reasoning to support the theory of inherency, the rejection of Appellants' claims on the basis of inherency should be withdrawn.

Relations Among Claims

Independent claims 9 and 17 are system and computer program product claims for creating a presentation document corresponding to independent method claim 1 that include "means for" and "means, recorded on [a] recording medium, for" creating a presentation document. For the same reason that Raman does not disclose or enable a method for creating a presentation document corresponding to independent claim 1, Raman also does not disclose or enable systems and computer program products for creating a presentation document corresponding to independent system claims 9 and 17. Independent claims 9 and 17 are therefore patentable and should be allowed.

Claims 2-7, 10-15, and 18-23 depend respectively from independent claims 1, 9, and 17. Each dependent claim includes all of the limitations of the independent claim from which it depends. Because Raman does not disclose or enable each and every element of the independent claims, Raman does not disclose or enable each and every element of the dependent claims of the present application. As such, claims 2-7, 10-15, and 18-23 are also patentable and should be allowed.

Argument Regarding The Second Ground Of Rejection On Appeal: Claims 8, 16, and 24 Are Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) As Being Unpatentable Over Raman In View Of Josephson

Claims 8, 16, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for obviousness over Raman in view of Josephson (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0023435 A1) (hereafter 'Josephson'). The question of whether Appellants' claims are obvious *vel non* is examined in light of: (1) the scope and content of the prior art; (2) the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art; (3) the level of ordinary skill in the art; and (4) any relevant secondary considerations, including commercial success, long felt but unsolved needs, and failure of other. *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1729-1730 (2007). Although Appellants recognize that such an inquiry is an expansive and flexible one, the Office Action must nevertheless demonstrate a prima facie case of obviousness to reject Appellants' claims for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). *In re Khan*, 441 F.3d 977, 985-86 (Fed. Cir. 2006).

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 the proposed combination of the references must teach or suggest all of Appellants' claim limitations. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 985, 180 USPQ 580, 583 (CCPA 1974). In rejecting dependent claims 8, 16, and 24, the Office Action relies on the previous §102 rejection arguing that Raman discloses each and every limitation of claims 1, 9, and 17. As explained above, however, Raman does not disclose each and every element of independent claims 1, 9, and 17. Dependent claims 8, 16, and 24 include all limitations of independent claims 1, 9, and 17 respectively. Because the proposed combination of Raman and Josephson relies on the argument that Raman teaches each and every element of independent claims 1, 9, and 17, and because Raman in fact does not teach or suggest each and every element of independent claim 1, 9, and 17, the proposed combinations cannot teach or suggest all the claim limitations of dependent claims 8, 16, and 24. The proposed combination of Raman and Josephson therefore cannot establish a prima facie case of obviousness, and the rejections should therefore be withdrawn.

In addition to the fact that the Office Action has not established a prima facie of obviousness there is at least another reason that the rejections of claims 8, 16, and 24 should be withdrawn: The Office Action does not examine Appellants' claims in light of the factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966) and mentioned above—that is: (1) the scope and content of the prior art; (2) the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art; (3) the level of ordinary skill in the art; and (4) any relevant secondary considerations, including commercial success, long felt but unsolved needs, and failure of others. "To facilitate review, this analysis should be made explicit." *KSR*, slip op. at 14 (citing *In re Kahn*, 441 F. 3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006)). That is, the Office Action must make explicit an analysis of the factual inquiries set forth in *Graham*. In present case, however, the Office Action does not even mention the factual inquiries set forth in *Graham*. As such, the rejections of claims 8, 16, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are improper and should be withdrawn.

Conclusion of Appellants' Arguments

Claims 1-7, 9-15, and 17-23 stand under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Raman. As explained above, Raman does not disclose or enable each and every element of Appellants' claims. Raman therefore does not anticipate Appellants' claims. Claims 1-7, 9-15, and 17-23 are therefore patentable and should be allowed. Appellants respectfully traverse each rejection individually and request reconsideration of claims 1-7, 9-15, and 17-23.

Claims 8, 16, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Raman in view of Josephson. As explained above, the combination of Raman and Josephson does not teach or suggest each and every element of Appellants' claims and the Office Action does not support the rejections by making explicit an analysis of the factual inquiries set forth in *Graham*. Claims 8, 16, and 24 are therefore patentable and should be allowed. Appellants respectfully traverse each rejection individually and request reconsideration of claims 8, 16, and 24.

In view of the arguments above, reversal on all grounds of rejection is requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge or credit Deposit Account No. 09-0447 for any fees required or overpaid.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 13, 2007 By: 

Thomas D. Fortenberry
Reg. No. 56,537
Biggers & Ohanian, LLP
P.O. Box 1469
Austin, Texas 78767-1469
Tel. (512) 472-9881
Fax (512) 472-9887
ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANTS

APPENDIX OF CLAIMS

CLAIMS

What is claimed is:

1. A method for creating a presentation document, the method comprising:

creating, in dependence upon an original document, a structured document comprising one or more structural elements; and

creating a presentation grammar for the structured document, wherein the presentation grammar for the structured document includes grammar elements each of which includes a structural element identifier for at least one structural element of the structured document.

2. The method of claim 1 wherein creating a structured document further comprises inserting in the structured document structural element identifiers for the structural elements.

3. The method of claim 1 wherein creating a structured document further comprises converting existing structural element identifiers from the original document to structural element identifiers for the structural elements of the structured document.

4. The method of claim 1 wherein creating a presentation grammar for the structured document comprises:

identifying the content type of the original document;

selecting, in dependence upon the content type, a full presentation grammar from among a multiplicity of full presentation grammars; and

filtering the full presentation grammar into a presentation grammar for the structured document in dependence upon the structural elements of the structured document.

5. The method of claim 4 wherein identifying the content type comprises identifying the content type in dependence upon a filename extension.

6. The method of claim 4 wherein identifying the content type comprises identifying the content type in dependence upon document header elements.

7. The method of claim 4 wherein filtering the full presentation grammar comprises writing from the full presentation grammar to the presentation grammar for the structured document each grammar element having a structural element identifier of a structural element that occurs in the structured document.

8. The method of claim 4 wherein the full grammar comprises a multiplicity of grammar elements for the content type, wherein each grammar element includes:

an identifier of a structural element;
a key phrase for invoking a presentation action; and
a presentation action identifier representing a presentation action.

9. A system for creating a presentation document, the system comprising:

means for creating, in dependence upon an original document, a structured document comprising one or more structural elements; and

means for creating a presentation grammar for the structured document, wherein the presentation grammar for the structured document includes grammar elements each of which includes a structural element identifier for at least one structural element of the structured document.

10. The system of claim 9 wherein means for creating a structured document further comprises means for inserting in the structured document structural element identifiers for the structural elements.

11. The system of claim 9 wherein means for creating a structured document further comprises means for converting existing structural element identifiers from the original document to structural element identifiers for the structural elements of the structured document.

12. The system of claim 9 wherein means for creating a presentation grammar for the structured document comprises:

means for identifying the content type of the original document;

means for selecting, in dependence upon the content type, a full presentation grammar from among a multiplicity of full presentation grammars; and

means for filtering the full presentation grammar into a presentation grammar for the structured document in dependence upon the structural elements of the structured document.

13. The system of claim 12 wherein means for identifying the content type comprises means for identifying the content type in dependence upon a filename extension.

14. The system of claim 12 wherein means for identifying the content type comprises means for identifying the content type in dependence upon document header elements.

15. The system of claim 12 wherein means for filtering the full presentation grammar comprises means for writing from the full presentation grammar to the presentation grammar for the structured document each grammar element having a structural element identifier of a structural element that occurs in the structured document.

16. The system of claim 12 wherein the full grammar comprises a multiplicity of grammar elements for the content type, wherein each grammar element includes:

an identifier of a structural element;
a key phrase for invoking a presentation action; and
a presentation action identifier representing a presentation action.

17. A computer program product for creating a presentation document, the computer program product comprising:

a recording medium;

means, recorded on the recording medium, for creating, in dependence upon an original document, a structured document comprising one or more structural elements; and

means, recorded on the recording medium, for creating a presentation grammar for the structured document, wherein the presentation grammar for the structured document includes grammar elements each of which includes a structural element identifier for at least one structural element of the structured document.

18. The computer program product of claim 17 wherein means, recorded on the recording medium, for creating a structured document further comprises means, recorded on the recording medium, for inserting in the structured document structural element identifiers for the structural elements.

19. The computer program product of claim 17 wherein means, recorded on the recording medium, for creating a structured document further comprises means, recorded on the recording medium, for converting existing structural element identifiers from the original document to structural element identifiers for the structural elements of the structured document.

20. The computer program product of claim 17 wherein means, recorded on the recording medium, for creating a presentation grammar for the structured document comprises:

means, recorded on the recording medium, for identifying the content type of the original document;

means, recorded on the recording medium, for selecting, in dependence upon the content type, a full presentation grammar from among a multiplicity of full presentation grammars; and

means, recorded on the recording medium, for filtering the full presentation grammar into a presentation grammar for the structured document in dependence upon the structural elements of the structured document.

21. The computer program product of claim 20 wherein means, recorded on the recording medium, for identifying the content type comprises means, recorded on the recording medium, for identifying the content type in dependence upon a filename extension.

22. The computer program product of claim 20 wherein means, recorded on the recording medium, for identifying the content type comprises means, recorded on the recording medium, for identifying the content type in dependence upon document header elements.

23. The computer program product of claim 20 wherein means, recorded on the recording medium, for filtering the full presentation grammar comprises means, recorded on the recording medium, for writing from the full presentation grammar to the presentation grammar for the structured document each grammar element having a structural element identifier of a structural element that occurs in the structured document.

24. The computer program product of claim 20 wherein the full grammar comprises a multiplicity of grammar elements for the content type, wherein each grammar element includes:

an identifier of a structural element;
a key phrase for invoking a presentation action; and
a presentation action identifier representing a presentation action.

APPENDIX OF EVIDENCE

This is an evidence appendix in accordance with 37 CFR § 41.37(c)(1)(ix).

There is in this case no evidence submitted pursuant to 37 CFR §§ 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132, nor is there in this case any other evidence entered by the examiner and relied upon by the Appellants.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

This is a related proceedings appendix in accordance with 37 CFR § 41.37(c)(1)(x). There are no decisions rendered by a court or the Board in any proceeding identified pursuant to 37 CFR § 41.37(c)(1)(ii).